

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 8-10, 35-40, 42, and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 1 and 35 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 5, 8-10, 35-40, 42, and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,870,611 (London Shrader et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,960,189 (Yinger et al.). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 5, 8-10, 35-40, 42, and 53 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1 and 35 are independent claims and recite similar features, as illustrated by amended claim 1:

In a system for managing application installation operations, a method of communicating with an application, comprising:

receiving from the application a call to set a property related to performing an application installation operation, wherein the application installation operation is a downsize operation, further **wherein the downsize operation comprises one of removing non-essential data and removing data that can be recreated from another source, wherein the data comprises video data;**

receiving from the application a call to initialize the application installation operation;

receiving from the application a call to finalize the application installation operation; and

if the application installation operation is not executed successfully by the application, receiving a call to abort the application installation operation.

None of the cited art teaches **the downsize operation comprising one of removing non-essential data and removing data that can be recreated from another source, wherein the data comprises video data.** There is no mention of video data anywhere in the cited art, let alone a downsize operation that removes video data. This feature has been added by amendment. Support for this amendment can be found on page 7 of the specification, for example.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0245/154792.2
Application No.: 09/843,199
Office Action Dated: December 15, 2006

PATENT

Because the cited art fails to teach or suggest each feature of claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1. Independent claim 35 contains similar features as claim 1, and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 35.

Claims 5, 8-10, 36-40, 42, and 53 are all variously dependent on independent claims 1 and 35, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for the independent claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claims 5, 8-10, 36-40, 42, and 53.

Date: March 15, 2007

/Michael W. Tieff/
Michael W. Tieff
Registration No. 57,845

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439